

Appl. No. 09/876,411  
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 16, 2005

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have hereby submitted this Request for Continued Examination and this preliminary amendment in order to highlight the distinctions between the presently claimed invention and the prior art. By this amendment, Applicants have modified the independent claims in order to further specify that the electromagnetic wave absorber does not provide any signal that is further processed by the device. Although Applicants claimed invention is substantially different than the Paulick reference cited by the Examiner, Applicants have submitted this amendment to clarify that the specified wave absorber cannot possibly be the antenna identified by the Examiner. Additionally, Applicants have submitted an information disclosure statement which provides the prior art identified by the Applicants in the specification.

This reference demonstrates the state of the conventional electronic device having electromagnetic wave absorbing material. As demonstrated by this reference, the wave absorber does not have a surface in contact with the conductive case of the device and a conductive member in contact with another surface of the wave absorber that is also connected to the case. The prior art cited by the Examiner is similarly deficient and does not even describe an electronic device having any and electromagnetic wave absorbing material. As noted above, the cited antenna is plainly distinct in light of the modifications to the claim language set forth above.

Applicants have also submitted new claims that specify the electromagnetic wave absorber is a body of material having a first surface in contact with the conductive case and


Appl. No. 09/876,411  
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 16, 2005

wherein a conductive member at an opposite surface is in electrical communication with the conductive case. The prior art of record similarly fails to teach or suggest this alternate expression of the invention.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance. The undersigned invites the Examiner to contact him directly should there be a need to address any minor informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/30/06

  
(Reg. #37,607)  
Robert J. Depke  
**TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI**  
**BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.**  
105 W. Adams Street, 36<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 704-1890  
Attorney for Applicants

Appl. No. 09/876,411  
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 16, 2005


wherein a conductive member at an opposite surface is in electrical communication with the conductive case. The prior art of record similarly fails to teach or suggest this alternate expression of the invention.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance. The undersigned invites the Examiner to contact him directly should there be a need to address any minor informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

1/30/06

  
(Reg. #37,607)  
Robert J. Depke  
**TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI**  
**BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.**  
105 W. Adams Street, 36<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 704-1890  
Attorney for Applicants